

For the following reasons, applicant asserts that the examiner's restriction requirement is improper. First, the examiner fails to differentiate the different species as required by MPEP § 806.04(h) para 3, MPEP §808.01(a) para 4. Secondly, the examiner fails to explain why he has determined there is more than one invention in said application as required by MPEP §803 para 1 under GUIDELINES. Thirdly, the examiner fails to specify which claims belong to which different species the examiner believes are patentably distinct. as required by MPEP § 806.01. .

The examiner also fails to show that he will be seriously burdened during the examination if no restriction/election is required as required by MPEP § 803.02, § 806.04(a) - § 806.04(i), § 808.01(a), and § 808.02.

The restriction presented by the examiner is improper. Applicant respectfully requests the examiner respond in accordance with the MPEP referenced above, and withdraw the restriction request.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark C. Comtois	Reg. No. 46,285
L. Lawton Rogers, III	Reg. No. 24,302
D. Joseph English	Reg. No. 42,514
Patrick D. McPherson	Reg. No. 46,255

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 776-7800  
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: January 17, 2003